



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/111,803	07/08/1998	HIDEO FUKUCHI	JAO-40854	6225

25944 7590 07/15/2002

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC  
P.O. BOX 19928  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

EXAMINER

CHUNG, DANIEL J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2672

DATE MAILED: 07/15/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/111,803

Applicant(s)

FUKUCHI, HIDEO

Examiner

Daniel J Chung

Art Unit

2672

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 19 June 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: \_\_\_\_\_.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) rejected: 1-33.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Applicant's arguments filed 6-19-2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued that the cited reference does not disclose that "a display controller causing a display unit to automatically forming a vertical scrolling display." (See Remarks p.1 line 8-p.2 line 2) However, Examiner strongly believes that the process of vertical scrolling is well known in the art. First, Burgan clearly discloses that "As is well known in the prior art, messages of length greater than the maximum number of characters that are displayable on the viewable portion of the visual display automatically process[could be any direction either vertically or horizontally], i.e., scroll, from one edge[top or left edge] of the visual display to another edge[bottom or right edge] of the visual display until the entire message has appeared on the visual display", in his background of invention. (See col 3 line 31-36) Also, knowing that the visual display in the teaching of Burgan has a multi-line, in ordinary skilled in the art, it is reasonable to adapt the processing of vertical scrolling into the Burgan. Also, In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references,(See Remarks p.2 line 23-25) the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, it was well known that the method of automatic scrolling in the Burgan will advantageously save the time and cost by eliminating the step of user's operation(i.e. moving mouse, enter key buttons), as it will allow the user to see next unrevealed information without delay. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skilled in the art to incorporate "automatic scrolling process" into the cited reference. More to that, many other prior art references[some discussed in previous office action] indicate that the process of vertical scrolling is well-known in the art. (See Fig 3, Fig 4, Fig 7A-C, col 1 line 11, col 1 line 23-39 in Kent (US 5,528,260); See Abstract, Fig 3, Fig 7, Fig 10-11, col 2 line 57-col 3 line 5, col 3 line 60-61 in Minematsu et al; See Fig 3, Fig 5, Fig 8, Fig 9, col 4 line 45-48 in Umei (US 5,795,048)) Furthermore, the processing of "wrapped-around"(causing a new line of character at the last line of one frame) in Alan Simpson ("Mastering WordPerfect 5.1&5.2 for Windows"; previously cited in office action) can also considered as "the vertical scrolling", as broadly claimed by applicant.



**MICHAEL RAZAVI**  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600